



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Was there a Second Isaiah? By Rev. Thomas E. Bartlett. (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1897; pp. 42, 16mo; \$0.10.) This pamphlet is a popular, not to say sarcastic, discussion of the critical theory respecting the book of Isaiah. The author seems fairly familiar with certain phases of the controversy, but less familiar with the spirit and aims of historical criticism. He gives the impression that the critics are bound to split the book of Isaiah at any cost, no matter what becomes of the truth.

The author labors under two errors. First, he thinks that the critic, because he is a critic, has little or no faith in the supernatural. Certain naturalists in matters of religion have promulgated critical theories. In the author's logic this means that to be a critic is to be opposed to revealed religion; and that, accordingly, believers in revealed religion ought to shun the results of criticism, or, forsooth, they have denied the faith. Secondly, he fails to understand the fundamental principle of historical criticism in its application to Isa. 40-66. He confounds simple predicting of the future with the prophet's taking his stand in some future time, knowing its peoples, conditions, and experiences, and then, from that as his historical situation, predicting events still future. The critic says, Here the analogy of prophecy must guide us; Mr. Bartlett, The analogy of prophecy has nothing to do with it; it is not improbable, it is, therefore, probable.

Mr. Bartlett applies to the critical theory two tests. The first concerns the explanation of the decree of Cyrus, and a fanciful difficulty is conjured up. The second shuts one up to the belief that the New Testament evidence is valid for authorship, or else he must deny the authority of the New Testament. That these are the only alternatives is due to the imagination of the writer rather than to the facts in the case.—H. R. HATCH.

Das Verhältnis des Menschenopfers zur israelitischen Religion. Von Dr. Adolf Kamphausen, Dekan der evangelischen theologischen Fakultät. (Bonn: Verlag von Röhrscheid & Ebbecke, 1896; pp. 80; M. 1.50.) The first sentence of this discussion is aimed at a *Programm* presented in 1895 by the dean of the Catholic theological faculty, in the same university, Dr. Kaulen, on Judg. 11:30-40, the so-called "sacrifice of Jephthah's daughter." The author of our *brochure* soon demolishes the figurative interpretation of his rival, and proceeds from this point to discuss the relation of this offering, and human sacrifice in general, to Israel's religion. He clears his way by